THE New Republic

The Won't-Do Or Can't-Do Congress

Pages 3-4

Has the North Clean Hands?

By CHESTER BOWLES

The Cross of Lorraine . . . . . *Percy Winner*

Time to Retire . . . . . *Gerald W. Johnson*

A Non-Nuclear Club . . . . . *Denis Healey*

Detroit's Sculptured Look . . . . *Frank Getlein*

NEW MEMBERS, NEW GOALS

Third in a Series on "The State of the Unions"

JULY 6, 1959

25 cents

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Washington Wire

Monarch and Semi-Monarch

LOOKING at those pictures of President Eisenhower and Queen Elizabeth reviewing the Canadian troops at the St. Lawrence Seaway ceremonies last week, we thought what a fine figure he made. Courteous, well-intentioned, dignified—he is the perfect ceremonial figure. As the London *Economist* deftly defined him—"the nearest facsimile a politician could provide to the desired figure of a revered constitutional semi-monarch." There they stood together in their lonely roles, Queen and President, the monarch and the semi-monarch. But the monarch does not dabble in matters which she does not understand. Sheltered and remote, she symbolizes that "vague dream of glory, or empire, or nationality," as Bagehot put it, round which Britannia rallies. Alas for the semi-monarch, it is when he descends from his cloud of sanctity into the hurly-burly of partisan life that his troubles start; then he must deal with hard and gritty problems reflected in the headlines of the newspapers which he does not read.

Yet Eisenhower needs little sympathy. Fortunes of the Republicans have ebbed to the lowest point in the century, but the President's Gallup rating mounts steadily. That is the way it is with semi-monarchs who oppose motion. Activists are criticized immediately in this world; neutralists get their criticism 20 years later.

Of all the bills yet sent to Eisenhower for signature or veto, the most important is the omnibus housing bill. That is because it is essentially an *urban* bill, and America has suddenly become an urban nation. Two-thirds of us now live in cities or suburbs; a million more move from farms to cities each year. But the cities are in desperate plight.

Cities are held in leading strings by rurally-dominated state legislatures. Their under-representation is outrageous. Furthermore, as rich and middle-class people move from cities to suburbs the municipal tax base shrinks. The city begins to rot at the center. Displaced poor people from the country—Negroes and whites — immigrate. Millions of children are growing up in these blighted slums. The American city is slowly losing its battle. It is one of our greatest problems.

The city resident is heavily taxed—that is the base from which most Federal taxes come. The omnibus housing bill is a method for turning part of these taxes back to the city in "urban renewal" (slum clearance), housing for the elderly, public housing, mortgage insurance and the like. These are not inflationary proposals; they represent investment in growth.

The housing bill was a test case of Democratic policy in Congress. The 1956 Democratic platform pledged housing, firmly and succinctly. In New York, Republican Governor Rockefeller has proposed a $2 billion housing program for that state alone. Yet the timid Senate and House Democratic leaders in Congress sent separate housing bills to conference and brought out a whittled-down compromise. They did this, Lyndon Johnson explained, to cooperate with the President and head off a veto.

This solution is good enough for Democrats from one-party Southern states who have no competition next year. But for liberal Democrats from the competitive urban North it is murder.

Inflation Report

THE NIXON CABINET COMMITTEE on Price Stability for Economic Growth has made its first report to the President, and it is a queer one. Nixon says that the economy is better off than ever but the danger of inflation greater than ever; that this is a "time of decision"; that he opposes wage and price controls (Query: who doesn't?); and that he favors sustained economic growth (Same query). As his big anti-inflation device he wants to raise the cost of hiring money by boosting the interest rate on government IOU's. Eisenhower says the report is "important to all Americans." Ho-hum.

Chester Bowles, who used to be governor of Connecticut, OPA administrator, ambassador to India and a lot of other things and who now is a freshman member of the House, asks one pertinent question of the Nixon report. Why does the Administration consider every other rise in prices inflationary, but a rise in the price of borrowing money "anti-inflationary"? It's one of those things that is hard to figure out. Incidentally, we keep running into people who say what a fine Presidential candidate Chester Bowles would make. Quite impossible of course, they add defensively, but it *would* be nice.

Letting Down Our Defenses

ONCE MORE the tiresome old warning is repeated to Americans who won't listen — "the Administration is letting down our defenses." It is a singularly impressive warning. It is a pamphlet written by Dean Acheson, Paul Nitze, and *NR* contributing editor James E. King Jr., and a distinguished advisory group of the Democratic National Committee. It is easy to dismiss it as partisan but it isn't: it is the same warning given by the Rockefeller Brothers' report, the Gaither report and all the others. There the facts stand; anybody can see them. Defense Secretary McElroy himself says that on present expectations the next three years will give the USSR a superiority of 3 to 1 over us in intercontinental ballistic missiles. Walter Lippmann calls the document "much the best in the field" but Eisenhower says, "Be calm." And who can argue with a semi-monarch.

Senator Kefauver's anti-trust subcommittee is giving facts on the steel industry which the Administration won't give. Price rises, for example. Prices for all wholesale manufactured products rose 32 percent between 1947 and 1958, the subcommittee's statistics show, but steel boosted its prices 100 percent. Profits have soared, too. US Steel made $7.47 a ton at the start of 1953; $19.31 per ton at the end of 1958. The steel industry is well able to grant reasonable wage increases without boosting prices, Kefauver says—or to keep wages the same and cut prices.

T.R.B.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The New Republic

A JOURNAL OF OPINION

VOL. 141, NO. 1, ISSUE 2329
JULY 6, 1959

THE WEEK 3

"Can't-Do" Congress?; The Proposal for a Non-Nuclear Club

ARTICLES 6

Has the North Clean Hands? by *Chester Bowles*

The State of the Unions—III by *Warner Bloomberg, Jr., Joel Seidman and Victor Hoffmann*

The Superficial Aspect by *Gerald W. Johnson*

BOOKS 17

ART 22

GILBERT A. HARRISON, *Editor & Publisher*
HELEN FULLER, *Managing Editor*
SELIG S. HARRISON, *Associate Editor*
ROBERT EVETT, *Book & Music Editor*
F. R. RUSKIN, *Asst. to the Publisher*
Contributing Editors: Alexander M. Bickel, Frank Getlein, B. H. Haggin, Irving Howe, Gerald W. Johnson, Stanley Kauffmann, James E. King, Jr., Helen Hill Miller, Michael Straight

Published weekly (except for omissions of four summer issues) and distributed by The New Republic, 1244 - 19th St., N.W., Washington 6, D. C. Phone: REpublic 7-8656. Entered as second-class matter September 26, 1950, at the post office at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Single copy 25¢. Yearly subscription, $8.00; Foreign, $9.00, Armed Forces personnel or students, $5.00. Subscribers desiring change of address should notify us at least three weeks in advance. Please include both old and new addresses.

Copyright 1959, by Harrison-Blaine, Inc.

Correspondence

► *The McCarthy Legacy*

SIRS:

I WAS very interested to read the piece on the late Joseph R. McCarthy by Karl Meyer in the *NR* for June 15. A key point made by Meyer is that if the Democrats had not carried the Senate by the narrow margin of 49-47 in the 1954

(Continued on page 23)

"Can't-Do" Congress?

LYNDON JOHNSON has every reason to wish that Mr. Eisenhower's veneration for George Washington as "our greatest President" would extend to the first President's concept of the veto. "You do me no more than Justice," Washington wrote to Edmund Pendleton in 1793,

> when you suppose that from motives of respect to the Legislature (and I might add from my interpretation of the Constitution) that I give my Signature to many Bills with which my judgment is at variance. . . . From the nature of the Constitution, I must approve all the parts of a Bill, or reject it in toto. To do the latter can only be justified upon the clear and obvious ground of propriety; and I never had such confidence in my own faculty of judging as to be over tenacious of the opinion I may have imbibed in doubtful cases.

The more tenacious Eisenhower interpretation of the Presidential veto power which classes as "doubtful" any legislation calling for more spending than the Administration deems wise is now setting Democrats against Democrats and making life hard for their leaders.

The running debate between Lyndon Johnson and his liberal critics turns in part on differing estimates of what "the people" voted for in 1958 and what they will vote for in 1960. The Majority Leader assumes that the mood of the country was and is essentially "moderate." And the evidence in support of this assumption is considerable. Doubtless there was an exaggerated tendency—inspired by wishes as much as cold analysis—to claim more for the Democratic landslide in 1958 than was there. It has been increasingly difficult to read the results of that election as a clear "liberal mandate." And this more restrained view seems supported by polls showing that a very large majority of the American people still believe Mr. Eisenhower is doing a good job and would probably re-elect him tomorrow if given the chance.

But in the first flush of victory last year, most of the 15 new Democratic Senators and 47 new Representatives took the returns as signifying endorsement of the New Deal-Fair Deal kind of progressivism for which most of them had campaigned. And Democratic Congressional leaders concurred in that interpretation in a general way. The day after the election, Senator Johnson announced that he would press for a 12-point program to include generous federal subsidies for housing, depressed areas, airports and legislation to reduce interest rates. It was thought that there was now a liberal majority (without the Southern Democrats) which could adopt measures killed in 1958 by the GOP-Dixie coalition—and perhaps even to pass legislation which the President had earlier vetoed—specifically aid to depressed areas and a more ambitious airport construction program.

But the President from the first moment made it known that he recognized no such "mandate": "We have got to stop unnecessary spending," he told his news conference, promising to fight the "spenders," as he called the newly-elected Democrats, "as hard as I know how." Johnson

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

proceeded to drive a housing and an airport bill through the Senate in the opening weeks of the session, and Speaker Rayburn was pushing the Rules Committee to allow the House to follow suit. A collision with the President on spending appeared just ahead.

It was at this point that new life was pumped into the old coalition. In return for Southern votes against spending, Republicans promised protection against further civil rights legislation and collaboration in curbing the power of the Supreme Court. The result was a very thin majority of 49-46 for the aid to depressed areas bill in the Senate—with 16 Southern Democrats voting with the Republicans. In the House, the Democratic-sponsored airport bill barely passed, and once again many Southern Democrats joined the anti-spending Republicans.

But in addition to renewing old friendships with the Southerners the Republicans began tightening their own lines in the Congress. Mr. Johnson had shown them how to do it. GOP leaders made places on the most desired committees for more progressive colleagues who might otherwise be led astray by Democrats—especially on urban problems. Minority Leader Dirksen wangled better assignments for Senators Cooper, Case, Javits and Morton and even gave up his seat on the Appropriations Committee to make room for California's Senator Kuchel. Under the leadership of Representative Halleck, who has warm relations with the White House, House Republicans were made to feel close to the President's wishes.

ALL of this has given Lyndon Johnson a defense for his "moderate" strategy other than one based on a subjective reading of the "mood" of the electorate—whether "moderate" or otherwise. He has accurately pointed to the fact that although the last Congressional elections weakened the conservative coalition—particularly in the Senate—the coalition still has more than enough power to sustain the President when he chooses to use his veto power. As the Majority Leader put it to the AFL-CIO unemployment rally in Washington on April 8, "For at least another year and a half every proposal must leap at least two hurdles. First it must find a majority in Congress. Then it must somehow secure the approval of the Executive, or at least get a two-thirds vote to override vetoes." "When government is divided," he went on, "the veto can be king." And, he might have added, when the Democratic majority itself is divided, even the threat of veto is a powerful deterrent.

The Republicans charge that this is a "Won't-Do" Congress, but the fact is that it is a "Can't-Do" Congress in that the Democratic leadership cannot command the necessary two-thirds to overturn any of the probable vetoes ahead in this session, at least not without elaborate maneuvering. Consequently, Senator Johnson has decided to stall for time and hold back most of his 12-point program until next year; Ike's term will be near its end and the closeness of the '60 elections may harden Democratic solidarity and lower Republican discipline. Meanwhile, the Johnson strategy calls for agreeing in advance to whatever concessions are needed to make pending bills "veto-proof" or easier to pass over a veto.

And here is where the Democrats differ most bitterly. "Those of us who come from states where the two-party competition is rough," Senator Clark of Pennsylvania argues, "*do* need a party record. . . . If the measures of this program would be vetoed if passed, then what we need is not 'veto-proof' legislation but 'vetoed' legislation." Democratic National Chairman Paul Butler and the party's Advisory Council share this view that "the people are entitled to have in this Congress more tangible results of the mandate they gave last November." To which, if they were on speaking terms, Senator Johnson might answer, "How?" And the Council would reply:

> It is our considered judgment that the interests of the nation and the people would best be served by passing the legislation the Democratic majority knows the country needs, and by putting it in the President's hands to sign or veto. We believe that this will have two beneficial results. First, more good legislation will be enacted than would otherwise be the case. Secondly, when and if bills actually are vetoed, the differences between the Democratic and Republican Parties would be brought into focus so that the voters will understand them clearly in the election of 1960.

How reasonable is the Council's belief? It may well be that by settling too soon for too little, Senator Johnson is abandoning positions which might, when the battle is joined, be held. In the intricacies of the legislative fight, no sweeping generalizations can be made about whether "this much" is "too much" or "too little." But on the Advisory Council's second point, a judgment is more easily made. Should the Democratic majority court vetoes in the interest of educating the public on both the character of the Democratic Party and the dangers inherent in divided government? Here the present majority does have a responsibility which goes beyond immediate possibilities. There are to be sure pressing, human wants on which action cannot be postponed. Housing is an example; a less adequate housing bill is preferable to none at all. But the longer-range obligation of leadership is to identify for the public that which is right and commanded by the national interest. If it takes that obligation seriously, some of the losses will be hard to bear. Nevertheless, the country will not move forward as fast and as far as it must unless positions are prepared in advance and political sights set far higher than those given the Congress and the country by Mr. Eisenhower. We shall all know at the proper time what "the people" want in 1960. But between now and then, what is wanted is a Democratic majority which chooses to explain patiently what our national potentialities and possibilities are and what the electorate might accomplish if it makes the right choices next year.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Proposal for a Non-Nuclear Club

London

EVER SINCE the issue of German rearmament was settled, the Hydrogen bomb has been the only serious threat to the British Labour Party's unity. The demand for a unilateral renunciation of atomic weapons by Britain has appealed to widely diverse groups of Labour opinion. Besides the pacifists who oppose the use of any sort of military force, there are many non-pacifists who feel that the long-term radiation effects of atomic weapons put them in a special moral category. Besides those who oppose NATO, there are supporters of the Western alliance who feel that Britain should leave atomic weapons as an American monopoly—either because they think Britain can afford to produce them only at the expense of more necessary types of armament, or because they fear that the British precedent will stimulate other European powers into seeking an illusory security through nuclear independence.

A year ago the Labour Party leadership spent several months in reaching agreement with the Trades Union Congress in a long and detailed statement of nuclear policy which succeeded in uniting the movement by concentrating on the steps which Britain should take to promote a ban on nuclear tests. Since then, however, the Conservative Government has adopted nearly all the measures recommended by the Labour Party, and partly as a result there are now prospects for agreement among the three existing nuclear powers for a ban on tests. On the other hand, such an agreement is threatened with violation at the outset by de Gaulle, who is planning to explode France's first nuclear weapon in the Sahara this summer.

It is not surprising that the demand for unilateral nuclear disarmament has gathered force again in Britain in the last few months. And yet no one could have predicted that, as *The New Republic* noted in its lead editorial last week, the largest and most right wing of the trade unions—the National Union of General and Municipal Workers—should have rejected its leaders' advice at its annual conference this June and committed itself not only to unilateral nuclear disarmament but also to the removal of American bases from Britain. A few days later de Gaulle's refusal to stockpile American nuclear weapons in France strengthened this trend—although the motives behind de Gaulle's move were quite different.

With a general election in the offing, Labour leadership faces the dreadful prospect of seeing the party once more split down the middle, or even worse, committed to a line of action which no British Government could conscientiously carry out. So it has been working with unprecedented vigor to complete a review of its nuclear policy (which was already under leisurely discussion) in time to influence the next group of union conferences in July. It has now succeeded in getting the support of TUC and the Parliamentary Labour Party for a new statement of policy which not only avoids all the obvious pitfalls but also contains a proposal which may make a real contribution toward halting the spread of nuclear weapons.

The new statement unequivocally rejects any weakening of NATO and all forms of unilateral disarmament. It frankly acknowledges that the spread of nuclear weapons capacity is a major threat to peace over the next generation and discusses what initiative Britain might take to avert the worst dangers. The best answer would obviously be a comprehensive disarmament agreement covering all countries and all weapons, such as was outlined in the shortlived Anglo-French proposals of a few years ago. But there is little hope that the US and Russia will agree to the type of inspection required for a cut-off of nuclear weapons production—at least in time to prevent fourth countries from starting to make atom bombs for themselves.

For, as a recent study by American physicists has pointed out, there is no longer any scientific secret about the H-bomb. There are already at least 12 new countries with both the economic and technical capacity to produce atomic weapons, and within five years there will be a dozen more. Moreover, although, as Britain is finding out, a system designed to deliver such weapons against a super-power like Russia is appallingly expensive, if the potential target is a small country with an unsophisticated defense system it should be possible to start producing effective atomic weapons for a sum as low as $50 million; even less, once you have industrial atomic reactors producing plutonium as a by-product. On the other hand, it would be easy to prevent atomic weapons production in any country which has not already started simply by inspecting its reactors.

THE LABOUR PARTY proposes that Britain should take the lead in establishing such an inspection system by offering to give up its own atomic weapons production once such renunciation is accepted by all countries *except* America and Russia. Of course, if America and Russia were also prepared to abandon nuclear weapons production, so much the better. But Britain should not give up her own bombs unless the further spread of atomic weapons can be effectively prevented. Though she might concede a permanent military inferiority to the two superpowers, she could not afford to be defenseless in a world

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that has become a jungle. This is no magic formula, for no one pretends that France would give up her nuclear weapons program the moment Britain made such an offer —though it would remove one of the grounds for de Gaulle's obsession with having his own H-bombs. But Labour believes that this proposal for a non-nuclear club would enable Britain to lead negotiations on this issue, and that Britain is the only power which can take an effective lead at the present time. As the Geneva negotiations for a test ban have already shown, possession of the weapons is the best qualification for influencing an agreement to get rid of them. And on the other hand, a power which like the US is not prepared to do without them herself cannot possibly persuade others to refrain from following her precedent.

DENIS HEALEY, M.P.

Has the North Clean Hands?

by CHESTER BOWLES

HALF OF ALL American Negroes now live in the North. There are five times as many Negroes in Chicago as in Birmingham, four times as many in Detroit as in New Orleans, six times as many in Los Angeles as in Miami. Yet many Northerners still smugly look at racial discrimination as a sectional problem, condemning what they consider to be the slow pace of integration in the South, while remaining indifferent or nearly so to the discrimination all around them.

There are 39 states outside the South. Only 19 have established Fair Employment Practices Commissions, three of them without any enforcement powers. In 20 other non-Southern states, there has been no legislative action on employment discrimination at all. Only nine states outside the South have adopted anti-discrimination legislation affecting publicly-assisted housing. In 30 other non-Southern states, no official action to end housing discrimination has occurred.

Some cities such as New Haven and Pittsburg are now taking far-reaching steps to rebuild themselves, including the slum clearance and human rehabilitation essential to the easing of racial tensions. But in many Northern cities the professed equal protection of the laws still hides extensive segregation in fact—by residential exclusion, and by the natural selection of poverty. In few of our major Northern cities do more than 20 percent of the Negro students attend school with white children.

Almost any Northern community that honestly examines its own racial relations will realize how far it is from living up to its professed ideals. And once we see what is missing in our own cities and states, we will be less inclined to feel that it is enough to denounce the foolhardy actions of white extremists south of the Mason Dixon line. Nothing will speak more persuasively to the South than a better example among the too ready critics in the North.

The Constitution *is* color-blind. The Fourteenth Amendment *does* require the end of racial discrimination in all parts of our public life. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights, endorsed overwhelmingly by the people of the world, affirms this as one of the first principles of world order. Moreover, our Constitution *will* be enforced. The Supreme Court has ordered desegregation with "all deliberate speed," and Negro litigants will see that this is complied with: the new Negro, arising in the South and elsewhere, will supply all the litigants necessary, no matter what pressures are organized to stop him. Regardless of what party is in power, the observance of the law ultimately will prevail.

And of course law itself is a powerful teacher. The end of segregation in the armed forces, in the nation's capital, and on interstate trains did more to convince many skeptics that integration in these areas made sense than any amount of talk could have done.

There appears to be a temptation, however, to rest on the oars of lawyers and judges and say that this is all now a matter of law and order. The President seemed to say precisely this when he stressed that he has told no one, not even his wife, whether he thinks the Supreme Court desegregation decision was right or wrong.

But Court orders alone will not suffice to change the minds and hearts of people.

The great hope is not for a reluctant and grudging acceptance of the inevitable force of the law. Our hope is that recognition of historical necessity will encourage an increasing effort to bring the various elements in each community into harmony.

If this were merely a legal issue between those who believe in upholding the law and those who seek to circumvent it, then there would have been no issue until the Supreme Court acted in 1954. But this turns the problem upside down. The Court acted because the Constitutional guarantee of equality involves the deepest political principles of this nation and because there was

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a *moral* issue presented which went to the heart of our Bill of Rights and our Christian civilization.

The law does not get its sanction merely because it is the law. It wins support because it embodies the moral purpose of society, and the task of political leaders, and of all who want to establish equal rights, is not only that of invoking and carrying out court decisions but also of convincing people that they are right.

That is why the proposal for an independent federal agency like the "Community Relations Service" advocated by the Senate Majority Leader could be so important. Conciliation, provided it is consistent with the guarantees of the Constitution, is precisely what is needed to *help* the law.

The spectacle of Negro children in Little Rock, in Clinton and Sturgis and Nashville and in the integrating cities of North Carolina walking quietly but bravely to and from school through jeering, angry mobs, shocked all Americans, as it did people around the world. When one remembers the fears of childhood—of changing to a new school, even when everyone is friendly and of the same race—one can imagine how these lonely Negro children felt in the midst of unfriendly white crowds.

Yet is not the old prophecy coming alive again? Are not the children leading us now? And not only the Negro children, but white children as well? In almost every city and town in the South where school integration has begun, the children are making out all right together. "If the grown-ups would just leave us alone, there would be no trouble," said a white student in Little Rock.

But many white Southern "grown-ups" are still content to say that the problem will take a long time to solve and that the Negro must be patient, perhaps forgetting that a lot of time has already passed.

It is 96 years since Emancipation, 183 years since a Southerner wrote the Declaration to which this nation is dedicated. That all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their creator with certain inalienable rights, and that to secure these rights governments are instituted among men—these are not just the words of Thomas Jefferson. They are the political creed of this country.

HOWEVER, the white Southerner has a case he can and should make. Generations of slavery, second-class Negro citizenship, inferior schools, houses and jobs are now plaguing us in the form of high rates of disease and crime and a low level of education in areas where Negroes predominate. To be sure, such demoralization is also the state of much of the rural poor whites of the South and Puerto Ricans brought up and trapped in our congested urban slums. But the Negro has been an outcast longest, has suffered most, and is now the most extreme example of a problem facing the whole country.

This argument is, indeed, a good reason for doing many more remedial things than integrating schools. But it is no reason for perpetuating the very conditions which produce the demoralization in the first place.

Take a county where a depressed Negro population outnumbers the white two or three or four to one. If that Negro community is ill-housed, ill-fed, ill-clad, if it is sick, ignorant and angry, can a relatively well-off white minority be "safe" in any meaningful sense of the word? Or take a big Southern city. If half of the town is a Negro slum, breeding uneducated bitterness, juvenile crime and racial violence, what kind of community will this be for the white people who say they want to live there?

The lesson is clear: The New South that is now taking shape has no room for low and inhuman standards of life for *anyone,* and instead of using demoralization as an excuse for doing nothing about integration, it should cause the Southern moderate to insist that a vast amount more must be done in a number of fields.

By proposing a far-reaching program to end the demoralization of much of the Negro community and of the poor whites, including slum clearance and measures for adequate housing and public health, the white South can then ask the Negroes, the courts and the rest of the country to accept a realistic pace for school integration: perhaps beginning only in the first grade and at the college and university level, with a voluntary transfer system, with even segregation by sex in some areas where coeducation adds to the fears about integration. But by holding back, Southern moderates leave the field not only to the white demagogues but to future Negro demagogues.

So far Negro leadership has been on the whole remarkably intelligent and restrained and the Negro people have accepted its counsel. A new Negro is standing up in the South and elsewhere. His expectations may not all be met, but some good and true men of the white South must meet him face to face, must talk with him and understand him. Without such a minimum response, it is too much to expect that the majority of Negroes will forever stand by the moderate ministers of the Gospel and the well-trained lawyers who now speak for them.

Let's face it: In many churches in America, a minister who goes against the prevailing sentiment of his congregation risks his job as much as the politician who alienates his constituents. Many bishops and ministers in the South have spoken against violence and in favor of law and order. But is this enough?

There will be violence, and the law will be frustrated, unless the two sides in the racial conflict now splitting every Southern community begin to communicate again with each other, to negotiate, to reason together, to find common remedies. Is this not the time for the white and Negro ministers of every Southern community to form a continuing roundtable conference dedicated to finding Christian solutions to community racial problems?

For, after all, no country should be in a better position than the United States to solve this problem this way. Not only do we have nearly two centuries of democratic

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

experience behind us, but the racial groups in this country, particularly in the South, have the great good fortune and blessing to share the Christian faith.

In our hearts we know the final answer. We know that we have done those things which we ought not to have done and left undone those things we ought to have done. We know that the pride of race, the fear of the strange and the different is one of man's original sins —that it has been fully erased from man's mind nowhere; that the sins of the fathers are visited on the children.

But we also know, as Lincoln said, that the Declaration of Independence "gave liberty not alone to the people of this country, but hope to all the world. It gave promise that in due time the weights would be lifted from the shoulders of all men, and that all should have an equal chance."

MY OWN perspective on this problem has been, I confess, affected by looking at it for some time from the other side of the globe. As a former Ambassador to India, I know how spectacularly American prestige rose as a result of the Supreme Court desegregation decision. While touring Africa four years ago, I sensed again how vital a successful solution of our racial troubles is for our future relationship with the two-thirds of the world's people who are colored. In the winter of 1957 in South Asia, I saw the enthusiasm generated by the successful conclusion of the Negroes' bus boycott in Montgomery, Alabama. Later in the Soviet Union, I saw the Communists take full propaganda advantage of the bombing of Negro churches in the same state.

No one but a cynic would argue that we should suddenly become interested in equal rights for Negroes merely because our propaganda position in the world would be helped by such progress. Nevertheless, it remains more true today than it was in 1947, when one of our distinguished former Secretaries of State, Henry L. Stimson wrote:

> No private program and no public policy, in any section of our national life can now escape from the compelling fact that if it is not framed with reference to the world, it is framed with perfect futility.

Finally, I should like to suggest that all of us can learn much from a study of that incredible man, Mahatma Gandhi.

There were always two sides to Gandhi's program. One was direct resistance to unjust laws or practices. The other was constructive popular action to create the conditions of justice. He began his career before the turn of the 20th Century in the Union of South Africa where he went as a lawyer for some Indian traders. In 1893, South Africa was a land run by some million Europeans who sat on top of some five million Africans who had almost no rights at all. In addition, there were 100,000 Indians most of whom had been recruited as cheap labor for the white plantations and mines. Soon after he reached Pretoria, the young man of 24 invited all the Indians in the city to a meeting. He urged them to fight racial discrimination but without hating or hurting their opponents. And since their aim was to reason with the whites, the first thing they should do, he said, was to consider the reasons given by the whites for their discrimination.

To the Indian merchants before him, known for slick dealings and sharp bargainings, he proposed complete truthfulness and more concern for the poor. He called on all Indians to do something to improve the unsanitary conditions in the Indian sections of town. Why wait for legal victories for the necessary drain-cleaning, he asked? We can't blame the whites for all our troubles, he argued. Perhaps we can't by ourselves end all the poverty in which our people are trapped, but if those of us with some money and some education will join in, the slums can be cleaned up, freshened with a coat of paint and made habitable; illiterate adults can be taught to read; volunteer schools can be provided for the children of the poor. And he began to build the institutions to do these constructive tasks.

In 1913 he returned to India after negotiating a settlement with Prime Minister Smuts who once jailed him but later came to say to him, "I am not worthy to stand in the shoes of so great a man." And for more than 30 years in India, Gandhi pressed his constructive program of village improvement, the end of untouchability, and the reform of individual lives.

The bus boycott in Montgomery carried out with dignity and restraint represented an adaptation of Gandhian principles in democratic America. "We are seeking to improve not the Negro of Montgomery but the whole of Montgomery," said Reverend Martin Luther King on the occasion of the formation of the Montgomery Improvement Association which conducted the boycott. Instead of merely sitting by until the Supreme Court ruled bus segregation unconstitutional, the Negroes of Montgomery in amazing unity carried out a courageous, peaceful, direct action which took the nation by surprise. It served as a kind of electric shock treatment shaking Negroes and whites alike from their lethargy. The long-term effects of this Gandhian-type action on the white conscience may take time to register. But it had an immediate effect in changing the Negroes.

Perhaps the change is best reflected in the story of the old Negro woman who, when asked if her feet were not tired from plodding so many miles each day to work replied, "Brother, for a long time my feet have rested, but my soul's been tired. Now my feet are tired, but my soul is resting." In this light, with good cheer, we *can* move ahead with all deliberate speed.

(This article is based on remarks delivered by Representative Bowles recently before a conference of the Health Welfare Council in Washington, D. C.)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE STATE OF THE UNIONS—III

New Members, New Goals

by WARNER BLOOMBERG, JR., JOEL SEIDMAN, VICTOR HOFFMANN

THE HIGH POINT of the AFL-CIO merger convention in 1955 was Walter Reuther's speech promising "a new beginning" for the American labor movement, a resurgence of organizing and of the militant and progressive spirit of the thirties. If some of the conservative representatives of the AFL were disturbed by this prospect, others appeared genuinely moved—at least for the moment. Afterwards, a top staff man from one of the most "progressive" unions recalled with a cynicism in which he specializes: "A lot of old duffs forgot their prostate troubles for a couple minutes and cheered wildly, but it won't take them long to remember they aren't a bunch of kids any more!" John L. Lewis testily predicted that the merger would prove to be a "rope of sand."

While the most dour anticipations have not been fulfilled, Reuther's enthusiastic image of unionism once more on the march has proved premature, if not wholly illusory. Somewhere along the line the "great new drive to organize the unorganized" met defeat, seemingly before it ever got started.

Some critics of American unionism have blamed the failure on an alleged loss of idealism, upon labor's too-willing accommodation to the existing social order: Without ferment, without dreams of a genuine transformation of American life, the millions in the non-union segments of industry and officedom cannot be aroused. This is a tempting theory, but it needs to be tested against the facts as known to those who have actually been out in the hustings promoting unionism.

For the officers of a union like the Textile Workers (TWUA), the most pressing problem is often survival. The gunfire at Henderson, North Carolina, is but a violent skirmish in a running war between the Union and some managements which have the TWUA's dissolution as their goal. Anyone who wants a difficult job, with ulcers virtually guaranteed, can find it by trying to unionize textile workers in the South.

Back of the employer's power and the worker's fear is the shrinking of the industry. In March, 1958, Sol Barkin, TWUA research director, told a Senate committee that employment in textiles had fallen from 1,146,000 production workers in 1941 to 947,000 in 1954 and only 820,000 when he testified. And the decline continues. While there had been a shift of the industry from North to South before World War II, there has been a substantial decline since in the South, though proportionately less than in New England and the middle Atlantic states. Foreign markets were lost to native industries or to exports from Japan or India, while substitute products, as well as Japanese competition, cut deeply into the traditional markets at home. Profits and wage rates alike lag behind the rest of manufacturing industry.

When mills are closing anyway, the operator of a chain of plants has the perfect device, wherever law and public opinion permit its use, for punishing workers who vote for union representation—and for frightening the remainder into acquiescence with non-union conditions. In Darlington, South Carolina, for example, the TWUA won bargaining rights by a narrow margin in an NLRB election among the employees of the Darlington Manufacturing Company on September 6, 1956. On September 12, the company's board of directors voted to call a stockholders' meeting to decide whether to close the mill, and at the meeting on October 17 the directors' recommendation to liquidate was adopted.

Two days later the first employees were laid off, and a month later the entire force of more than 500 workers was jobless. The 80-year old mill, biggest employer in town, was shut down. Machinery was moved out, the mill and remaining equipment sold at public auction. An NLRB trial examiner, following hearings on charges of unfair labor practice, found the company guilty of coercing its employees and closing to avoid collective bargaining; yet the only prescription he could devise was to order the company to rehire its employees if it resumed operations.

What good is a prescription when the patient is dead? The president of the Darlington Manufacturing Company, who controlled a majority of its stock and therefore made the outcome of the stockholders' meeting inevitable, was Roger Milliken, also president of Deering, Milliken & Co., a New York concern engaged in selling

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and merchandising textiles. This concern, which represents 30 mills as exclusive selling agent, owns and controls each of these mills though each is separately incorporated. Officers of the parent concern also serve as officers of each of the operating subsidiaries, and a majority of the stock of each subsidiary is held by the parent company, its officers and directors, and members of their families and friends. The TWUA is seeking to have Deering, Milliken & Co., as well as Roger Milliken personally, held responsible for the unfair labor practices, in which case orders of back pay and offers of jobs at other Milliken mills, one only 10 miles away, could be issued.

While the Milliken case slowly ground its way through the NLRB and into the courts, the closing of mills continued to have an impact on union organizing efforts in the South. If an employer fails to remind workers that shut-downs may be the fruit of a union victory in an NLRB election, the local paper will probably do it for him. The union too worries that its efforts may lead to unemployment. The TWUA, after getting elections set up in five plants of the Cannon chain in the spring of 1958, withdrew in all cases because it feared that it might win only in some, and that these plants might then be closed.

"If You Don't Want . . ."

IF FEAR OF losing one's job is a powerful restraint on the free choice of a bargaining agent, the race issue further befuddles the prospective union members. The appearance of union organization is frequently followed by the distribution of "hate" sheets, which are always anti-Negro and often anti-Semitic and anti-foreign as well. Sometimes the argument is used directly by the employer, sometimes the literature is mailed anonymously to the homes of workers, and sometimes it is distributed by "volunteer" committees at factory gates. In any case the argument, which has gained in shrillness since the issue of desegregation in education became acute, is that only by defeating the union can white supremacy be preserved.

The AFL-CIO News

Typical of much of the material is an eight-page pamphlet distributed last spring at the gates of the Jefferson Mills of Pulaski, Virginia. Measuring 11 by 17 inches, the pamphlets contain pictures of Walter Reuther giving a check for $75,000 to the NAACP, of Negroes intermingled with whites at CIO meetings, and of a Negro man dancing with a white girl. The first page, in heavy letters over an inch and a half high, consists of this message: "The TWUA will 'benefit' you by destroying all segregation in the South." Attention is duly paid to AFL-CIO support of desegregation in education, to opposition to segregation in plant eating places, locker rooms and rest rooms, and to a TWUA denunciation of the White Citizens Councils. One picture purports to show a colored shop steward backing up a foreman who is disciplining a white worker. Examples are given of Southern workers who quit the union over the segregation issue. The pamphlet concludes:

> If you don't want your children in an integrated school; if you don't want your wife or daughter in "mixed" meetings; if you don't want the Textile Union's New York bosses to integrate you; vote against the TWUA every chance you get!

Other literature distributed in the South identifies unionism with mongrelization and Communism, and attacks union officers as Jews, foreigners, Communists or racketeers.

More temperate appeals, often in letters sent directly by the employer to the individual employee, have also been widely used throughout the South. Typical is the nine-page statement distributed by the Charles H. Bacon Company of Lenoir City, Tennessee, to its full-fashioned knitters at Loudon early in 1957. Charges are made that the union organizers are interested only in collecting dues, that union representation could bring no gains in earnings, that plants in which the union had bargaining rights had closed, that the union had a record of strikes and violence, and that unionism means losing the right to settle problems personally with management.

In addition a full page is devoted to the race question. Opposition to segregation in plant eating places, locker rooms and rest rooms, as usual, is duly noted, and so is the $75,000 AFL-CIO contribution to the NAACP. *"The Unions,"* says the letter in an underlined passage, *"are working day and night, and pouring out the money which they collect in dues, in an effort to eliminate segregation and to bring about integration in the schools and elsewhere between the white people and the colored peo-*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ple as rapidly and completely as possible."

Added to these handicaps faced by the union organizer is the economic, political and social power that employers have in many mill towns that are completely or almost completely dependent on the company payroll. In many cases the town officials are either members of management or subservient to them. "Licensing" ordinances may be passed, making it illegal to sign up dues-paying members unless a license is first obtained, at exorbitant cost. In extreme cases union representatives may be beaten up or driven out of town, while the police look the other way—though there is less physical fear in the South now than formerly. Thanks to the pressure of the company or local businessmen allied with it, the union may be unable to hire a meeting hall or buy space in the local paper. In some cases clergymen who are dependent on the company for financial aid have joined the campaign against the union.

The workers, it must be remembered, typically come from a rural background, and lack a tradition of unionism—indeed, of any kind of group activity except in a church. Accustomed to company paternalism, they may readily be persuaded to reject the union organizer as an outsider. Added to this is the power of the company to force captive audiences of their employees, to question employees about their union affiliation or sympathy, and to evade bargaining for several years even if the union wins the election. The wonder is not that the union loses so many elections in Dixie, but that it wins any of them.

If the Textile workers have suffered most in the South, they have not suffered alone. While the more established unions have not been "cut up" over the issue of Negro rights within unions and in the community, as some feared they would be, none of them is able to make gains of any proportions in organizing. Most of them have in times past successfully faced the opposition of powerful employers entrenched in company towns and supported by the bulk of institutionalized religion, but the new sensitivity to the race question has made their task almost insurmountable for the present. As the South continues to industrialize, this block to organizing can sap more and more of the national strength of organized labor. Those who find it difficult to distinguish between the modern labor union and the modern corporation in America today might do well to look at the complete capitulation to the South's "peculiar institution" on the part of management, except when the unions force them to move in the direction of equal rights for Negro workers.

Yet the failure of the "drive to organize the South," launched with such fanfare after the merger, cannot be attributed solely to management's tactics. In certain communities and certain industries, drives which began to show signs of real progress were partially sabotaged by local labor leadership, mainly AFL. According to some knowledgeable Southern unionists, the long-established building trades wanted no industrial union strength in their bailiwicks; and selling permits was as profitable and less troublesome than taking many new members into their crafts. Nor did they want integrated locals to contrast with their own 'lily-white" policies, which they still maintain in spite of AFL-CIO national policy and George Meany's personal opposition to racial discrimination.

The strongest industrial unions have not backed down, however, in their established locals. The Packinghouse Workers always refused to take in locals which demanded segregation. The Steelworkers once had some segregated locals, but these have been eliminated in recent years—although some discrimination with respect to promotions within plants persists. The Rubber Workers, with locals in Mississippi, Alabama, Georgia and Tennessee, have none that are segregated. It takes a good deal of courage to maintain even the outward form of minority rights within Southern unions today. Yet some of the most impressive examples of inter-racial harmony to be found anywhere in the country exist in certain deep-South local unions. "Please," said the international official who disclosed the facts about these cases, "don't print a word that might identify these men. I doubt if we could keep it up once the White Citizens Councils got on us." If established locals are so jittery, what chance does the organizer have?

Opposition Outside the South

SOUTHERN manufacturers are not unique though few elsewhere now can engage so successfully in tactics of intimidation and union-busting. In many places in the industrialized North and Midwest (and apart from extreme cases of the Kohler type) unionism is still strug-

THIS IS the third of a series of articles examining the American labor movement since the merger.

MR. BLOOMBERG, once an hourly-paid employee in a half-dozen different factories, is now Associate Professor of Sociology at Syracuse University and a contributor to *Harper's, The Reporter* and *Commentary.*

MR. HOFFMANN, once an agricultural laborer and canning factory employee, is now Professor of Government at Valparaiso University in Indiana and contributes articles to *The Lutheran Quarterly* and *The Cresset.*

MR. SEIDMAN has been an organizer and labor education worker, is now Professor of Industrial Relations in the School of Business at the University of Chicago and has written many studies of union leadership and union democracy including *Union Rights and Union Duties.*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

gling for bargaining rights against determined and sophisticated employers.

For example, General Electric, a giant corporation with far-flung operations, bargains with a variety of unions, the principle one being the International Union of Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers. But almost a third of GE's employees are still non-union, and the company carries on a sustained campaign through plant newspapers and bulletins, letters to workers, and the like to increase that proportion and to prevent any further unionization. In September, 1958, it successfully opposed the Sheet Metal Workers at its Chicago Hotpoint plant. Three days before the election it used a full-page "advertisement" in its plant newspaper which asked "What will a 'No' vote mean?" and then answered the question:

- ☒ No taking orders from outsiders at union headquarters.
- ☒ No secret constitution to tell you what to do.
- ☒ No initiation fees.
- ☒ No monthly dues.
- ☒ No special assessments.
- ☒ No loss of wages due to strikes and walkouts.
- ☒ No interference with your right to work.
- ☒ No welfare fund scandals involving your money.
- ☒ No union picket lines, boycotts or coercion.

A simulated paycheck was distributed showing $36 deducted for union dues and "reminding" employees that there would also be deductions for fines, assessments, and initiation fees. At its Roanoke, Virginia, plant, where IUE was already the bargaining agent, the company organ, *GE Reporter,* reminded members of their withdrawal rights under a contractual "escape clause" by a cartoon showing a worker within a walled enclosure with a second figure saying, "Once a year it opens up, and you can get out." Where elections for bargaining rights were about to be held, GE has pledged in newspaper ads that whatever gains were made by IUE in other plants would come automatically to these workers, whether they voted for the union or not. Quite clearly, GE has not accepted the IUE or any other union as a permanent institution.

Tough-minded anti-unionism, though there is less and less of it among most of the largest manufacturers, is also still prevalent in the smaller cities and towns and among the independent or semi-independent firms where so large a proportion of the unorganized millhands are now located. A sustained and costly organizing drive frequently is required to gain for a union a small addition to its ranks, one that may be of dubious loyalty and perseverance. Slim, wiry Sam Pollock of the Amalgamated Meat Cutters is president of a nine-county district that includes Cleveland and Akron and all the small Ohio cities and towns between and around these two metropolitan centers. He has seen the routine:

> A plant struggles to organize . . . and you negotiate a first contract and have to go out on strike, and finally win. But then the employer tries to retrench and fights the new local on everything, and after awhile—if it seems like little or nothing has been gained and held—the spirit gets broken.

Union organizers also argue that the National Labor Relations Board has become, in effect, a tool for managements resisting organization instead of an agency to facilitate development of unions where they are desired by workers. Managements have shrewdly taken advantage of the Board's ordinarily slow procedures, using all legal means for postponing settlement of bargaining rights, sometimes for two or three years. This hardly helps sustain the morale of new unionists.

Those Who Won't Help Themselves

BUT EVEN where the special conditions of the South, of determined anti-union managements, or of trouble with the government do not obtain, organizing may be a difficult task. In some ways, according to Charles Heymanns, AFL-CIO region 12 director, organizing was easier in the past. His office aids in the unionizing of retail workers and clerks, service people, janitors and custodians, and—whenever possible — county and municipal employees, employees of banks, and Blue Cross workers. These groups include some of the most dependent, anxious, and rigidly middle-class members of our society. Far from doubting the McClellan Committee's specific allegations about union corruption—proved and unproved—they are prone to generalize all such indictments and apply them to all of organized labor.

Even within as yet unorganized industrial areas, passivity toward unions has to some degree been transformed into resistance—so argues Machinist district 54 president Matt DeMore: "It used to be that when you tried to organize a plant, you found a minority strongly pro-unionizing, a minority absolutely against it, and a large majority who might go either way. Now you run into this kind of pattern in the small plants, which are the ones still not organized—there are 30 to 40 percent in the plant who are pretty interested in the idea and the possibility of having a union, and then you run into a stone wall. The rest are dead set against it, or—at least—the uncertain group is pretty small. The companies are doing a better job of creating confusion than they used to and enjoy a pro-management NLRB."

> (SEIDMAN: Although the prompt action of the AFL-CIO against corruption has helped protect the Federation's reputation, this issue still has placed the entire labor movement on the defensive. It has helped create a climate of opinion that makes fresh organizing extremely difficult, especially among white-collar groups.)

> (BLOOMBERG: And after all, the big organizing drives of the thirties were built up around the mass-production in-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

dustries of the large cities and took place with the aid and encouragement of the federal government. They were not just a matter of mood or sentiment. You cannot re-create those conditions.)

(HOFFMANN: I would not dismiss "mood" and "sentiment," however. Before, during and just after World War II there was in America a sense of purpose, of excitement. Today we are cautious, security conscious, often quite placid. Even the so-called "revival of religion" seems to be more a matter of status and sociability than of spiritual fervor. In a sense we have all become "defensive.")

The intentions of most of those who applauded Reuther's "new beginning" speech so enthusiastically in 1955 had in fact always been narrower than what he proposed—to hold what they had more than to launch a new mass movement complete with the secular evangelism of large-scale organizing. They had agreed upon only a minimum set of fundamental principles of operation as a unified federation. But the contribution of the AFL-CIO to the failure of its own organizing efforts involved sins of commission as well as omission. The old AFL and CIO had very different conceptions of the role of organizing. Within the AFL it was primarily a function of the affiliated national union, while the CIO allotted more funds for this purpose to the federation and, despite its smaller size, maintained a larger corps of organizers who were equally available if an affiliated union needed assistance or if a centrally directed campaign was to be launched. The small AFL organizing staff was used mostly to service directly affiliated federal locals. AFL members, before the merger, paid only four cents monthly to the AFL, whereas the CIO per capita was 10 cents. CIO leaders argued for a similar 10-cent figure for the merged body, but have had to be content with six cents plus a penny assessment.

Due to CIO insistence on a centralized organizing corps, one was established at the time of the merger with 300 persons, three-fourths of them from the CIO. That staff had shrunk substantially by the end of January, 1958, when it was slashed by 100 more, partly as an economy move, partly because organizing work appeared so unproductive. Some organizers were laid off or retired; others were transferred to another kind of work, many to "public relations"—primarily the task of combatting right-to-work legislation in the states. CIO leaders, while agreeing that such assignments were necessary at the time, have feared that the organizing staff might never be restored to its former size and that the old AFL conception of the role of organizing would prevail in the future.

It must be kept in mind that a major segment of the former AFL unions, the building trades, have long had little reason to concentrate on organizing. They have recruited new members, particularly in the cities, through tightly-controlled apprenticeship programs, often supported by city building codes requiring the use of "recognized" or "accredited" or "licensed" workmen in such crafts as the electrical and plumbing trades. In larger cities vocational and technical high schools have provided them with new recruits. The "organizing" function in such a context consists largely of trying to keep the "itinerant" from getting into the act. They have little understanding of or sympathy for the industrial unions' large-scale recruitment of unorganized workers almost wherever they are found, in any and all kinds of workplaces. Some of them have called the corps of organizers "the CIO department."

The Teamsters are as organization-minded as an international could be, but they are out of the AFL-CIO. And even if they had not been expelled, their asserted right to recruit anyone who in any indirect way comes into contact with anything shaped like a wheel would have made them the focal point of endless jurisdictional disputes. This underscores another serious problem for the AFL-CIO organizing staff. As a service department created to aid the entire Federation, it could under no circumstances favor one wing of the merged body or even one affiliated union over another. Consequently, it could not conduct an organizing drive, or even give assistance to a particular union on request, until any conflicting jurisdictional claims had been resolved. Pending a mutually satisfactory settlement of these notoriously stubborn disputes, or the imposition of one by the Executive Council, the organizing department had no choice but to postpone action.

The White-Collar Challenge

SO FAR, we have noted the handicaps and slow-downs in organizing since the merger. But we must also note that in recent months morale in the organizing department has begun to revive. Some of the internal stumbling blocks are being over-ridden, and the staff anticipates eventual recognition of their usefulness by even the building trades crafts. Sorties into the South will be conducted with greater sophistication, inside the union movement as well as outside. Much of the "deadwood" has been trimmed from the staff (some unions looked upon the organizer's job as a "pasture" for officials of increasing age and declining usefulness). Perhaps most important, plans for moving into the "non-blue-collar" field have been thoroughly overhauled.

Proportionately more and more employees in our society work for salaries rather than wages. But they are not all "white collar," in the old sense of the word. The greatest growth is among technicians and sub-professional research and engineering personnel, on the one hand, and the variety of people in the service trades, on the other. The image of unionism is so closely linked in the public mind with industry and with the building trades

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that it is easy to forget how many non-blue-collar people have already been organized—actors, musicians, newspapermen, retail clerks, telephone operators (CWA), postal clerks—not to mention strong white-collar departments in industrial unions such as Steel, UAW and IUE. If it is not to represent a relatively smaller instead of a relatively larger segment of the working population, the union movement must find a way to create an image of itself acceptable to those who work in smocks and suits but who now cannot identify themselves with "a union." The unions, in turn, especially the organizers, must be sensitive to the needs and desires of these "middle-class workers."

The greatest progress in organizing the retail industry has been made in California, where the unions have pioneered a pension plan — an especially important achievement for "over 45" clerks in retail stores. More typical than California, however, is the Cleveland area where a Retail Workers four-county local of about 8,000 members constitutes one of the largest in that union. Most of its members are in food stores, bakeries and some dairies. The "momentum of the chain effect in organizing," as one organizer put it, is an important reason for hitting the groceries first. In addition, the big department stores have strenuously resisted organization, even though the warehouse people, maintenance men and tailors in them already belong to unions. (But then, what saleswoman speaks with the electrician?)

In any case, barring some drastic change in national moods and emotions, the most the unions can hope for in the retail field is a more rapid accumulation of small successes. Much the same can be said for other white-collar groups—insurance, auto sales and the like—where some union beachheads have been established. A significant breakthrough is conceivable, though it is still in the dreaming and planning stage, with respect to engineers, technicians, lab assistants and other trained specialists of the new technological era. Union organizers will go to them with proposals that take account of their particular needs—opportunities for more training, opportunities for research of personal interest, adjustments in constraining bureaucratic procedures — in addition to demands for better salaries and benefits. But a recent study indicates that most engineers, at least, look to their professional associations or to individual action to gain these ends.

More attention will also be paid to the characteristics of the organizers in terms of this new audience with whom they must communicate. In the past, middle- and lower-middle-class people have reacted negatively to organizers whose "blue-collar" mode of speech and behavior have aroused anxieties about social status and prestige. All studies have revealed these sensitivities and anxieties to be especially intense in the worlds of the quasi-professionals and the pseudo-professionals. And some of the old-style organizers could never become adept at the "soft sell." For many unions in the AFL-CIO these challenges implicit in the long-term shift taking place in the American occupational structure seem very remote. They have their own worries to preoccupy them. At least, they will not interfere with new organizing efforts—though 39 different unions claim jurisdiction over various non-blue-collar types of workers.

Half-a-Pie, Now!

IN ADDITION to all the practical and more obvious stumbling blocks to organization listed above, it is possible that lack of "spirit," of "ferment" or of "idealism" also plays a part. If so, there is little evidence that unions are doing much to develop exciting, new goals calculated to quicken the interests and enlist the loyalties of the unorganized. Most workers who are organized have been getting more and more of what unionists say they wanted —higher wages, job security, some security with respect to illness, unemployment, old age. And although there is pulling and hauling between management and union over the administration of contracts, a rule of law has replaced the arbitrariness, which sometimes became tyranny, of industrial managers. From the union point of view, these accomplishments reflect the "real" needs of workers, and those who do not turn to unions in order to achieve them are, by definition, "unrealistic."

Steel and Auto, for example, have been staggered by the recession and are confronted by relatively fewer jobs for returning workers than there were when the lay-offs began, thanks to automation and other technological contributions to productivity. But while there has been a great deal of talk in the shops about the "six-hour day," it is no more than a bargaining counter in the present negotiations. As Steelworker secretary-treasurer I. W. Abel put it, "Too many problems have to be solved, public acceptance has to be developed, and it will all take a good deal of agitation."

In an Ohio city a Steelworker district staff man, formerly president of a large local in a notoriously anti-union plant, outlined some of the problems with the hard realism of his breed:

> We already have trouble with some of our people taking on a second job. Given a six-hour day, you'd have more "moonlighting." That wouldn't do much to help unemployment and, frankly, the employer is entitled to a fresh man, not one pooped out from working 12 or 14 or 16 hours a day. But how can we prevent it? And how can we handle the problems of more leisure time for those who don't use it up by doing more work?

In a local union office several Steelworkers suggested as an alternative to the shorter day, the shorter week—with every weekend in effect a "three day holiday." One of them, hefty of build and humorously inclined, said they had had that "short work week for almost a year

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

around here. We just want to make it official!" They seemed content to wrestle with the "problems" of more leisure, if they could get it without loss of pay. The actual outcome of the steel negotiations, with or without a strike, will likely involve basic wage rates, pensions, insurance, the company's share in paying for fringe benefits, better unemployment benefits and the like.

The Auto Workers abandoned the shorter work day (or week) during their last round of negotiations "because of economic conditions." ("They *scuttled* it," say Steelworkers as part of the propaganda of inter-union rivalry.) They, too, plan for more prosaic gains in the near future. At a regional office in a large city a group of staff men in shirtsleeves, typical of Auto's almost lonely maintenance of working-class style, talked about additional fringe benefits, protection for men dislocated from jobs by plant movement, better productivity increases, elimination of wage inequities and the investment of pension fund monies where it would help lagging local economic conditions. "What we go after depends upon the demands of the rank and file," one of them asserted, repeating part of the Auto Worker catechism. (But the staff men do a good job in helping to generate and shape these "rank and-file demands," especially in the smaller shops outside the Big Three production centers.)

Top leadership in the Rubber Workers, which has already won the six-hour day for some workers, would prefer to go in new directions—perhaps for the shorter work week, or for other goals they now consider more meaningful. But the rank and file have kept up the six-hour-day demand wherever it doesn't now exist. (Other union leaderships, especially Steel, have noted that the desire for a shorter working day can become a trap, limiting a union's flexibility in shaping its proposals from year to year.) The familiar chant of pensions, insurance improvements and wage increases is heard in Rubber Worker offices, too.

Except for that universal desideratum, higher wages, there seem to be few specific goals shared by all segments of organized labor. In some of the building trades crafts, where work remains relatively unbureaucratized and men may shift from the trade into contracting and back again, there is little demand for pensions. Older men, once they have their social security benefits coming in, may shift into part-time work, sometimes in partnership with sons or other younger kinsmen. Industrial union leaders, oriented to the procedures of the mass-production factory, often do not appreciate the sense of craft shared by the men whose workplaces and jobs are always changing and who seek to protect what is constant in their situation—the skills they carry in their minds and muscles. The craft unions have not attempted, as have the Teamsters, to rationalize the industry over wide geographical areas, but have left it the kind of highly flexible collection of many small (and sometimes ephemeral) firms which maintain highly personal relationships—and "deals"—among business agents and contractors. This rules out fringe benefits requiring mass-member funding in cooperation with large-scale employers or employer associations.

"Money still has highest priority among our members," says Matthew DeMore, popular president of District 54 of the International Association of Machinists.

> Occasionally at a shop meeting you will hear someone ask what good a wage increase would do if prices go up. But these people are in a small minority. Still, you hear much more of this than before—in fact, you never used to hear it all.

Union leaders at all levels mentioned their concern over members' acceptance of "this Chamber of Commerce line," as many of them put it.

To some technical and white-collar groups who see the world in terms of more than shorter hours, higher wages and grievance procedures, unions appear selfish and expedient to the extreme. To this, most union leaders reply that the "old battles" have not been won for most workers. And they still see as the best tactic for changing our culture and social system the continuous repetition of "more."

> (BLOOMBERG: If performing artists — musicians, actors, singers — can be organized and associated with the union movement, why not technicians or engineers? If such relatively well-educated and middle-class types as newspapermen and mass-media production people can accept, and if necessary strike for, conventional union goals, why not officeworkers and clerks? I have a feeling that there are some ideological and political beliefs and feelings which we have not really comprehended in considering this matter of organizing some of these groups.)

> (HOFFMANN: I am worried about the suggestion that unions must find ways of appealing to "more middle-classish" people. It may be that they have already accommodated themselves too much to the general pattern of American life. I doubt if being "respectable" is usually compatible with being "imaginative" or with "idealism." I am concerned that unions continue to fight for the fellows on the lower rungs of the ladder, and I'm not at all certain that they need expanding members to carry on that fight.)

> (SEIDMAN: Certainly the labor movement, speaking for relatively large numbers of people in relatively underprivileged positions, makes an important contribution to social welfare. But it remains selfish in the sense that all groups are selfish—it is a force to serve its members. Our society is made up of such groups. But it is important to realize that unionism could lose membership faster from technological change in organized areas than it can gain new members elsewhere.)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Superficial Aspect

When's Time to Retire?

THIS YEAR, as in every month-of-June outburst of commencement oratory, various speakers have sounded the customary note of alarm over the economic, social and moral wastes involved in the rule of compulsory retirement of workers, especially brain workers, at the age of 70.

Some waste of talent there certainly is, but there are also enormous economies, and it is debatable that society suffers a net loss. As one getting close enough to that age to take a vivid personal interest in the matter, I may be permitted the observation that most men at the age of 70 are so nearly dead from the neck up that their room is far more valuable than their company, and they should be amputated for the health of the organization.

It must be admitted, however, that among the gaffers a considerable proportion—at a rough guess 10 percent—were never more lively, intellectually, than they are at threescore years and 10; and when an old man's brain is hitting on all cylinders, the power which it delivers is fabulous.

This is accounted for not so much by its initial energy as by the fact that the ancient has already fallen into every imaginable trap and so has developed a canniness that enables him to bring his full force to bear, while a young man loses half of his in false starts and waste motion.

It follows, therefore, that while retirement at 70 is correct in principle it is a process into which automation ought not to be introduced, and the fact that it is introduced is evidence of failure on the managerial level. Yet the commencement orators rarely, if ever, mention that aspect of the matter.

The supreme qualification for a manager is the ability to judge men correctly, but this ability is limited in its application by the physical limitations of the human body. You can judge, well or badly, only those men whom you know, and the number you can really know is relatively small—much smaller than the number of employees of a minor business enterprise. The exercise of selectivity in eliminating deadwood is therefore beyond the power of the manager of an establishment of moderate size, as business enterprises go in modern America. The best he can do is adopt some rough approximation of selectivity, such as the rule of compulsory retirement at 70.

Inevitably this means waste, both from the standpoint of the company and that of the compulsorily retired individual; but perhaps the greatest waste of all is that of the judgment of the manager which cannot be brought into play. Obviously, fine judgment exercised in eliminating deadwood and at the same time retaining the wisdom and skill acquired by long experience, would add enormously to the efficiency of an organization without one cent of additional expense. An increase in efficiency with no increase in expense is all profit; but this profit is denied when judgment cannot be exercised.

Every businessman on the upper levels is aware of this factor, but it is seldom mentioned even by public speakers who question the policy of compulsory retirement at 70 or any other arbitrarily fixed date. Perhaps they are wary of it because it suggests a built-in limit of managerial capacity, and that is heretical because it implies a built-in limit on the size of highly efficient business organization.

The late Justice Brandeis was a conspicuous leader of a school of thinkers who oppose big business because it is big; but their argument is mainly against concentration of economic power lest it become too strong for social control. But the limit of managerial capacity suggests that an equally strong argument against bigness is that it is inherently too weak at a crucial point—that of wisdom—to reach the highest attainable efficiency.

THE RECENT history of the automobile industry gives supporting evidence to the theory. It was in a relatively small outfit that somebody in the highest echelon had a memory that went all the way back to the initial success of the Tin Lizzie and repeated it when the cult of bigness finally wrecked its own market. I do not know the age of the individual chiefly responsible, but while his years may have been few, he had an old man's memory.

Agamemnon and Achilles are without doubt symbols of youthful vigor; but Nestor also was among the heroes and his automatic retirement at a fixed date would have deprived the expedition of valuable services, and what that date may be is irrelevant. There is, in fact, only one absolutely inviolable date for retirement. It is the moment when the doctor takes the stethoscope out of his ears, straightens up, and tells the assembled family that he will willingly get in touch with the undertaker of their choice and instruct him to take care of the necessary arrangements.

GERALD W. JOHNSON

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BOOKS & COMMENT

The Cross of Lorraine

by Percy Winner

TO THE GROUP of self-made leaders of people who enacted and embodied in the first half of the 20th Century the 19th-Century Nietzschean philosophy of the will to power, perhaps the most noteworthy example still alive and in high public office in the Western world is Charles de Gaulle. Of course, he is in a totally different category from the most notorious siblings of the breed; in style, dignity, decency, honesty, integrity there is little in common between him and Mussolini, Hitler and Stalin although his conception of his role as *chef* has some clear similarities with that of the others. Moreover, unlike the aggressive universalism implicit in the role of the others, de Gaulle assumes the "priestly role" of mystic and messiah for his own country alone; he loves France as a man loves a woman who is all women. And he wills to power not simply for himself but on her behalf. It can be said of him as he, in his memoirs says of President Roosevelt, "His will to power cloaked itself in idealism."

Charles de Gaulle
by Arthur Layton Funk
(Oklahoma; $5)

•

The War Memoirs
of General Charles de Gaulle:
The Call to Honour
(Viking; $5)
Unity, 1942-1944
(Simon & Schuster; $6)

•

On the Game of Politics in France
by Nathan Leites
(Stanford; $4.50)

In his first talk with Roosevelt, at the Anfa conference in January 1943, he claimed the right—the moral right if not the legal right—to represent France and argued that Joan of Arc, in her time, had no better right than his, no firmer investiture. Mr. Roosevelt was not convinced; on the contrary, he used—and also misused and distorted — de Gaulle's bracketing of himself with Joan on very many later occasions to prove his own right to distrust the Frenchman. The mutual lack of comprehension of Roosevelt and de Gaulle, their dislike and suspicion of each other strongly colored the relations between the allies, then and more recently. A fairer version of de Gaulle's conception of himself and his role emerges from the talk he had a month earlier, in London, with Admiral Stark, on the eve of a visit to Washington which was cancelled because of the assassination of Admiral Darlan in Algiers. As reported by Commander Kittredge, who was present:

> De Gaulle was also convinced that French culture, intelligence and capacities of leadership were so widely diffused in France that when any elite or governing class failed France, through decadence or defeatism, new individuals were always projected upward out of the French masses to give enlightened and inspired leadership to "eternal France"; that this had been true through the centuries from the time of Charlemagne to that of Hitler. Thus de Gaulle referred to the rise of the Capetian royal house, to Joan of Arc, to Henri IV, to the revolutionary leaders (1789-93), to Napoleon, finally to Poincare and Clemenceau; de Gaulle added—"perhaps this time I am one of those thrust into leadership by circumstances, and by the failure of other leaders."

While not new, the quotation is given in Arthur Funk's book in the context of the fullest, clearest and most objective account and analysis yet published of de Gaulle's relations with Roosevelt, Churchill and Stalin. The Vichy policy, for which Admiral Leahy was, more than any other single individual, responsible, was certainly one of Roosevelt's great—if not grotesque—mistakes, particularly when the President clung to it and to its companion anti-Gaullism against all the evidences of its growing error. But FDR argued "because of the few thousand Frenchmen who left their homes to join him, de Gaulle had no right to speak on behalf of the 40,000,000 who appeared to be satisfied with Marshal Petain." Funk says the President thought de Gaulle "too egocentric, too rigid and too dictatorial to survive the hurly-burly of democratic politics." And Secretary Stimson wrote: "To the President, de Gaulle was a narrow-minded French zealot with too much ambition for his own good and some rather dubious views on democracy."

FAR more important was President Roosevelt's foresight that de Gaulle would resist and obstruct the inevitable postwar current of liberation and independence of the colonial possessions of the European powers. But Funk draws up an objective balance sheet and credits de Gaulle with having, in fact, won a place in French history beside that of Joan of Arc. Nevertheless, despite his enormous development between 1940 and 1945, "he never acquired that magnanimity, that breadth of view or that sense of honor which might have rendered his achievement far greater than it was."

"French exclusion from Big Three deliberations," says Funk, "by no means resulted simply from Roosevelt's hostility to de Gaulle. . . . All three chiefs of state agreed that the Big Three was a very exclusive club, the entrance fee being 5,000,000 soldiers or its equivalent." The fee was, naturally, far beyond de Gaulle's capacity to pay and he was accepted as a partner by Roosevelt only after Churchill foresaw the coming split with Stalin.

At the time, Roosevelt's over-riding concern was military — with winning and shortening the war, with saving lives, especially American lives; de Gaulle's concern was political—as Funk says "France found in de Gaulle the unique voice which summoned her to

Next Week

The Dour Man

Robert Graves reviews
a "lost" comedy of Menander

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

believe in the magnificent heritage of her past." Funk's book is required reading for those who would like to understand why a mystic—albeit a very realistic and practical mystic—dares to make seemingly impossible demands now of the man who emerges from the history of the second World War as his best American friend, General Eisenhower, and why an ardent anti-Communist crusader presumes to threaten the solidarity of the Western alliance.

THE FIRST two volumes of de Gaulle's own war memoirs should find a large public among those who can appreciate fine historical writing. The first volume of the English translation preserves—but the second quite loses—the brilliance and beauty of the original French version which is close to being a masterpiece. Whatever else history's verdict may be, de Gaulle's writing must already be accorded a place in the mainstream of the finest French tradition of letters. The superb opening pages contain the famous passages: "France is not really herself unless in the front rank . . . France cannot be France without greatness." The appraisals of men and their motives are extraordinary, succinct and searching—Petain, Reynaud, Pope Pius XII, Willkie, Eisenhower, Roosevelt. "The United States," he writes, "brings to great affairs elementary feelings and a complicated policy" whereas for France "policy had to be action in the service of a powerful and simple idea." Two other passages are important:

> The United States, delighting in her resources, feeling that she no longer had within herself sufficient scope for her energies, wishing to help those who were in misery or bondage the world over, yielded in her turn to that taste for intervention in which the instinct for domination cloaked itself. . . . From the moment America entered the war, Roosevelt meant the peace to be an American peace. . . . Like any star performer he was touchy as to the roles that fell to other actors.

The other is more timely:

> It is the West that must be restored. If it regains its balance, the rest of the world, whether it wishes to or not, will take it for an example. If it declines, barbarism will ultimately sweep everything away. . . . Western Europe is essential to the West. Nothing can replace the value, the power, the shining examples of these ancient peoples. This is true of France above all . . . it is in the political realm that she must recover her vigor, her self-reliance and consequently, her role.

Algeria gets little space, but the argument is made again and again—as, for example, in an account of how de Gaulle tried to save for Italy part of her African colonies—that Europe must fight to keep what it still has in Asia and Africa,

Spiders

Is the spider a monster in miniature?
His web is a cruel stair, to be sure,
Designed artfully, cunningly placed,
A delicate trap, carefully spun
To bind the fly (innocent or unaware)
In a net as strong as a chain or a gun.

There are far more spiders than the man in the street supposes
And the philosopher-king imagines, let alone knows!
There are six hundred kinds of spiders and each one
Differs in kind and in unkindness.
In variety of behavior spiders are unrivalled:
The fat garden spider sits motionless, amidst or at the heart
Of the orb of its web: other kinds run,
Scuttling across the floor, falling into bathtubs,
Trapped in the path of its own wrath, by overconfidence drowned and undone.

Other kinds—more and more kinds under the stars and the sun—
Are carnivores: all are relentless, ruthless
Enemies of insects. Their methods of getting food
Are unconventional, numerous, various and sometimes hilarious:
Some spiders spin webs as beautiful
As Japanese drawings, intricate as clocks, strong as rocks:
Others construct traps which consist only
Of two sticky and tricky threads. Yet this ambush is enough
To bind and chain a crawling ant for long enough:
The famished spider feels the vibration
Which transforms patience into sensation and satiation.
The handsome wolf spider moves suddenly freely and relies
Upon lightning suddenness, stealth and surprise,
Possessing accurate eyes, pouncing upon his victim with the speed of surmise.

Courtship is dangerous: there are just as many elaborate and endless techniques and varieties
As characterize the wooing of more analytic, more introspective beings: Sometimes the male
Arrives with the gift of a freshly caught fly.
Sometimes he ties down the female, when she is frail,
With deft strokes and quick maneuvres and threads of silk:
But courtship and wooing, whatever their form, are informed
By extreme caution, prudence, and calculation,
For the female spider, lazier and fiercer, than the male suitor,
May make a meal of him if she does not feel in the same mood, or if her appetite
Consumes her far more than the revelation of love's consummation.
Here among spiders, as in the higher forms of nature,
The male runs a terrifying risk when he goes seeking for the bounty of beautiful Alma Magna Mater:
Yet clearly and truly he must seek and find his mate and match like every other living creature!

DELMORE SCHWARTZ

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and must resist having the locus of world power shifted from Europe to Asia and Africa.

Nathan Leites' book on the Game of Politics in France also is unusually timely. It is a fine hard-minded study of how the political gamesters of the Fourth Republic paved the way for de Gaulle's "second coming." It describes and analyzes the causes and nature of instability, of the built-in irresponsibility, the buck-passing, the backing out of or the scuttling of a policy at the last moment, the waiting game, and other political habits of the parliamentarians who were once called "the republic of pals." Leites explodes the myth of the great importance in post-war French political life of the intellectuals, of ideologies or even of ideas. The book is also a study of how de Gaulle exploited the coup of May 13, 1958 in Algiers, using the army two ways against the middle on his own behalf—and, of course, France's behalf. No one yet knows, with certainty, whether or not the extremists in the army were really about to parachute men from Algeria into France to take over the government; but it is clear that the threat—real or false—became the key to the *fait accompli*. To those who did not yet find de Gaulle good, he was without doubt a lesser evil than the parachutists.

In the first volume of the war memoirs, de Gaulle says of an earlier *fait accompli:* "I realized, once more, how strongly accomplished facts, when they have right behind them, influence men's attitudes and even their convictions." Leites notes that on May 19 de Gaulle approved the army's coup because "the army judged it to be its duty" and that on June 4 he told General Massu in Algiers: "I approve of you for having discerned the will of the people and of the army." But the significant fact, as brought out by Leites, is that the people had no will—one way or the other. Precisely because so few people cared, it was the will to power of the army—on behalf of de Gaulle—which counted. Leites comments: "Just so eighteen years earlier a republic had disappeared . . . One saw that almost nobody was willing to increase his chances of dying so as to enhance the life expectancy of the regime." He says also; "Parliament underestimated the frustration of the professional officer class of the army and overestimated the force of 'republican legality'." Algeria killed the Fourth Republic; de Gaulle exploited the assassination to make the so-called Fifth, which has yet to cope seriously with either the problem of Algeria or of a French army which, according to a French President, has the right to discern the will of the people.

Among the Frenchmen who have held political power since the first World War, de Gaulle is, morally, a giant—but a giant among pygmies. He may perhaps be judged the greatest Frenchman thus far this century. But, for all his invocations of righteousness, it is too soon to know whether his advent to power in 1958 will, in the long run, be less damaging to the French people—not "the lady France"—than was the advent to power of Petain in 1940. Petain was an heir to defeat. He understood the nature and meaning of Hitler's will to power as little as Neville Chamberlain had, and he compounded his error by the crime of making France the only one of the nations subjugated by the Nazis which gave Hitler official governmental collaboration—out of fear of meeting the fate of Poland.

De Gaulle bitterly opposed such conduct at a time when Roosevelt condoned it. But in 1945 de Gaulle was the heir to an illusory victory; although helped by the French Resistance (for not all of which he spoke), the accomplished fact of the liberation was not really his or France's. He failed to understand—or to admit—that the conduct of the minority of Frenchmen for whom he did speak could not and did not nullify the conduct of Petain and a majority of Frenchmen. Deluding himself into the belief that France really had won, really had worked her passage back, he confused his own will to power with the illusion that France as a nation could renew or recover the glory and grandeur of a long dead past simply by his own charysmatic act of will. In 1946 he should have learned better.

Now, once again, in 1959, de Gaulle wants France in the front rank; and, once again, by an act of faith and by a will to power, he assumes that his wish is automatically fulfilled. At present the general's closest political associate abroad is Adenauer, and if his demand for a voice in the concert of Western power were no more strident than the Chancellor's, the record of France might sustain him. But nothing in the record, either during the war or afterward, provides a basis for parity with the Great Britain which stood alone in 1940 and which, in India, showed an understanding of the world of today which France has not yet shown in Algeria.

It is plain, however, that de Gaulle has learned the lessons of the duel with Roosevelt; he has come to understand that if, this time, he is to get into the club of the Great, he must improvise, at least, the entrance fee which he does not, once again, truly possess. Now, in 1959, the entrance fee is the possession nuclear weapons, of thermonuclear warheaded ballistic missiles. To get such weapons and to share in the making of world strategy based on their possible use would, of course, put France abreast of Britain among the Great of the free world.

So de Gaulle is resorting to a remarkable strategem both to get them and to get support for his policy in Algeria: he is privately—and not so privately—arguing that it is not NATO but the French army in Algeria which is developing the tactics and the psycho-military techniques and organisms needed for an "inevitable" war against Communism. So long as Algeria failed to be put, somehow, in the context of the Cold War, America would not be interested. So the young officers, the veterans of Indo-China who had learned about Mao Tse-tung through Ho Chi-min, and the generals, are all concentrating on giving de Gaulle his entrance fee. But whatever anyone's visions may be of a battlefront extending from the Atlas Mountains to the Ural Mountains, nothing in the facts in France since 1958 or in Algeria since 1954 really justifies France's—that is, de Gaulle's—"right" to support in Algeria, to A-bombs, and to a share in world atomic strategy.

"New York puts up *18.5% of any national tax levy. But the percentage of any federal aid program New York is due to receive is 6.9%. In other words, New York congressmen willing to spend, say, $100 millions of 'federal' money for education, will find themselves voting to tax New Yorkers about $275 million. By contrast, Mississippi puts up 0.22% of the federal tax dollar—and gets back 2.07%. A fair question: 'Do New Yorkers know what they are up to when they support federal aid to education?'"*

From the current issue of NATIONAL REVIEW. Write to 150 E. 35 St., New York 16, N.Y., for a complimentary copy.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Freedom and Economics

by Robert Lekachman

NOT very many travelers know much economics. Not many economists do much traveling. As a result, most books which compare the economies of different lands suffer either from superficiality or scholarly remoteness from persons and places. To these generalizations this book is a pleasant exception. Its author, a professional economist of distinction, knows at first hand the countries which he compares, among them Russia, England, Poland and Yugoslavia.

The Economy, Liberty and the State
by Calvin B. Hoover
(Twentieth Century Fund; $5)

His major preoccupation is the relationship between economic systems and human freedoms. And this preoccupation leads him to ask the big questions: Do authoritarian political practices impede growth? Does nationalization of industry inevitably lead to less freedom? In the United States, does the continued growth of large economic organizations —corporations and unions—necessitate the expansion of government power as a counterweight? If it does, must this expansion in turn narrow the scope of individual liberties?

Naturally, Mr. Hoover's answers are tentative on many of these questions. The case of Russia illustrates one of his larger apprehensions, the danger that it is organization which influences human attitudes rather than human attitudes which determine organization. How is this so? The Russians, in the first place, have demonstrated that extreme political repression and high rates of economic growth are entirely compatible. In a sense, still more discouragingly, they have enlisted whatever they liked of capitalism in their own interests. Managers and workers alike are paid according to output and the result is a distribution of income less equal than the English and probably than the American. One might infer from Mr. Hoover's sober account that large individual units are typical of advanced technological societies, and that these units work very well indeed under tight central controls.

How does the English experience bear upon these conclusions? The British, even at the height of British Labour Party control, stopped far short of the detailed central controls over output, labor movement, consumption, and investment which the Russians feature in their planning. Perhaps because of this moderation, Mr. Hoover judges that nationalization has not significantly narrowed the liberties of Englishmen. Unfortunately, all that this seems to indicate is that nationalization has had little effect of any kind. English workers toil no harder in the service of the nationalized industries than in the service of the private enterprises of the bad old days. Technical advance has been more rapid in the private than in the public industries. Finally, the Labour Party—a group dedicated to democracy—has failed to resolve a central dilemma: close control of the nationalized industries implies rationing, price controls, and direction of labor; looser control may render imperceptible the difference between public and private enterprise. The unresolved bureaucratic problem is, how can a democracy make sure that its planners do not infringe on liberties.

Because we are richer and younger than European societies, the dilemma is not yet acute in the United States. Nevertheless, the tension between the necessity of more government control to cope with the problems of an organizational society and the likelihood that at some critical level greater government intervention will limit personal freedom, exists and threatens to tighten. In this country, the critical issue appears to be inflation. At present, we settle wage and price increases by precarious treaty among big companies, big unions, and big government. One observes that the Eisenhower Administration after trying to keep out of the current steel dispute has now offered a plan of its own. As Mr. Hoover sees it, crises of this sort invite more and more government intervention. Imperceptibly, the role of the government in the determination of wages and prices grows. At some point, he fears, liberty which rests upon free movement of capital will suffer.

Is there any escape from the tendency and its consequences? About the best that Mr. Hoover can do is to emphasize the absolute necessity of avoiding economic crises, and the critical need of developing criteria for settling wage and price issues. In democracies, depression renders inevitable the kind of government action which may hamper freedom. Depression precipitated Hitler into power, and conceivably only the Marshall Plan saved France and Italy from the outstretched hands of native Communists.

Possibly Mr. Hoover is too pessimistic about the attachment of the ordinary citizen to the values of democracy. The New Deal surely did more to save rather than to imperil democracy. Nor is Mr. Hoover's criticism of intellectuals for their failure to defend capitalism quite to the point. The major inadequacy of his own otherwise excellent book is the absence of a theory which explains how giants among corporations and unions conduct their affairs. If intellectuals do not furnish such a theory, who will?

I'm walking on air...

Just had my annual medical checkup. (Smart move.) I'm making out a check to the American Cancer Society, right now—that's a smart move, too.

Guard your family!
Fight cancer with
a checkup and a check!

AMERICAN CANCER SOCIETY

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Correspondence

(Continued from page 3)

election—only because Senator Morse switched—that it is quite probable that McCarthy, as a committee chairman, might have had a much longer reign.

In this regard, I think those who are considering Senator John F. Kennedy as a possible contender for liberal support in 1960 should be familiar with the fact that Kennedy, because of a minor personal feud with Governor Foster Furcolo, refused to endorse Furcolo for the Senate in 1954, and as a result Senator Saltonstall was elected by about 30,000 votes. Since the national Senatorial elections were known to be so close, Kennedy's action might single-handedly have been responsible for Senator McCarthy keeping his power.

There are other facets of the Kennedy-McCarthy situation that should be examined. Kennedy of course refused to criticize McCarthy in any way till years after his death, and indeed made several rather favorable remarks about him; and Robert Kennedy—as is now often forgotten—went to Washington in January, 1953 as a staff aide to McCarthy, at McCarthy's request, at the very height of the man's power. Not till Kennedy had a highly publicized *personal* feud with Roy Cohn (the Kennedys are famous for decisions on the basis of personal feuds, rather than issues) did Bob Kennedy go over to the Democrats who broke with McCarthy on his Committee in the summer of 1953.

PAUL HORAN

Boston, Mass.

". . . Whatever happened to Schine"

KARL E. MEYER (*NR*, June 15) asks "and, by the way, whatever did happen to Dave Schine?" I'm enclosing a clipping from *The Springfield* (Mass.) *Union* about the strike at the Hotel Northampton—one of the hotels in the chain of which G. David Schine is president:

A city Council resolution passed without opposition Monday night accused the Hotel Northampton of locking out striking employees. . . . "It is the considered opinion of the members of this council that the so-called strike at the Hotel Northampton for the past six months is in reality a lockout of the union employees," the resolution stated. . . . "In our opinion," it continued, "the absentee ownership of the hotel has displayed an arrogant, uncompromising and uncooperative attitude toward its long time employees and to the general welfare of the community. . . ."

Northampton has reason to know that Schine has not retired to a life of contemplation and repentance.

CARL WALZ

Northampton, Mass.

". . . 'Timid silence' indeed!"

IN a third-hand report, T.R.B., (May 18, 1959) alleges that, according to an unnamed correspondent, an as yet unpublished book charges a "timid silence" to the Anti-Defamation League in respect to the Fort Monmouth situation.

"Timid silence," indeed! Three years ago, the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith prepared a report on anti-Semitism which was published as a 382 page book, entitled *Cross-Currents* (Doubleday). One of the book's major chapters, captioned "The Fort Monmouth Scandal," devoted 55 pages (about 15% of the book's total contents) to the McCarthy investigation at Fort Monmouth. We pointed out not only that the then chief security officer at Fort Monmouth was apparently an anti-Semitic bigot but stated also that " . . . the established criteria for security evaluation are so devoid of safeguards that malicious rumor and the most careless hearsay can be the bases for suspensions and losses of security clearances."

In addition, we said:

> The unfortunate public impression that Communism was rampant among the suspended civilian personnel at Fort Monmouth, and that it was rooted almost without exception in Jews, came largely from the collateral activity of the [McCarthy] Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations.

So much for the book we published in 1956. If your unidentified correspondent will take a look at *The New York Times* of August 27, 1954—almost five years ago—he will find a three column article reporting that in February 1954, the

The New Republic welcomes communications from its readers in regard to subjects of current interest. Those of 300 words or less lend themselves to publication more readily than longer letters.

AUTHORS WANTED BY N. Y. PUBLISHER

New York, N. Y.—One of the nation's largest book publishers is seeking manuscripts of all types—fiction, non-fiction, poetry. Special attention to new writers. If your work is ready for publication, send for booklet RP—*it's free.* Vantage Press, 120 W. 31st St., New York 1. (Midwest Office: 220 So. Michigan Ave., Chicago 4, Ill.)

EUROPE

We'll see the usual, plus Dublin past the Iron Curtain—Africa to Sweden. A different trip—for the young in spirit who want to be accompanied but not herded around. Also shorter trips. $724-$1390.
EUROPE SUMMER TOURS
255 Sequoia, Box NR Pasadena, California

YOUR SAVINGS EARN MORE!

INSURED* 5%

ALSO! LIST OF 50 HIGHEST-RATE FED. AGENCY INSURED SAVINGS ASSNS.
Mail ad for details — last call! N
INVESTORSERVICE
11 W. 42nd St., New York
LA 4-7665 • a FREE service
Free gifts! *commercially

NEW OPPORTUNITY—GIVES EXTRA MONEY for you or your organization. Show **MASTERPIECES BY EVANS,** fabulously-beautiful Christmas cards. Wonderful assortment for persons, business houses. Send for **FREE** luxurious album of 86 magnificent 1959 selections. Also, **FREE** "Complete Guide For Fund-Raising For Your Club." Write: **New England Art Publishers, North Abington 769, Mass.**

WANTED: College Teaching Position
Completing Ph.D., political science-theory, high school teacher 1938-59, historian—Army, social worker, member ACLU, ADA, WILPF, Pres.—Teachers Union; $7,500 minimum, Box 484, Willoughby, Ohio.

FREE BOOK SEARCH SERVICE
For current, rare, old or out-of-print books. Write for information or send list to Dept. R.
Libertarian Bookman
Box 7709 Chicago 80, Ill.

$70 WEEKLY — home, spare time. Simplified mail bookkeeping. Immediate income — easy! Auditax, 34757 DA. Los Angeles 34.

EXPERIMENT WITH "SLEEP-LEARNING!"
Use your phonograph, recorder.
Fascinating, educational. Catalog, details free.
Sleep-Learning Research Association,
Box 24-NR Olympia, Washington

WE MOVE YOU WITHOUT TEARS
Economical, insured household moving. **Vans,** station wagons. Any time, any place. **The Padded Wagon, AL 5-8343 (NYC)**

BRITISH SHOES FOR GENTLEMEN at a fraction of their American retail price! **$10.95** includes duty and import charges. **Delivery in ten days from receipt of order. Unconditional money back guarantee. Write for free illustrated catalogue. Steven Williams, Jr., Ltd., 40 Chatham Road, Short Hills, New Jersey.**

CLASSIFIED RATES

Per word (single insertion)	12c
Per word 6 times in one contract year	11c
Per word 13 times in one contract year	10c
Per word 26 times in one contract year	9c
Per word 52 times in one contract year	8c

NEW REPUBLIC
1244 Nineteenth St. N.W., Wash. 6, D.C.

PRINTED BY NATIONAL PUBLISHING CO., 501 N ST., N. E., WASHINGTON 2, D. C.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Anti-Defamation League had delivered a 10,000 word memorandum to the then Secretary of the Army, Robert T. Stevens, urging an immediate and thorough investigation to determine whether Jewish employees at Fort Monmouth had been treated differently, and adversely, from Christian personnel.

ARNOLD FORSTER
B'nai B'rith
Anti-Defamation League
New York City

My "unnamed correspondent" was an editorial in *The American Jewish Ledger* of March 31, 1959 (published in Newark, N. J.), according to which "one of the strangest phenomenon in this whole Monmouth fantasy was the refusal of the ADL and the American Jewish Committee to go to the aid of the suspended Jews."—TRB

► *Was D. H. Lawrence an Anti-Semite?*

SIRS:

TO REPLY to Mr. Dexter Martin's letter (*NR*, June 8) without, I hope, seeming to be a professional anti-anti-Semite, I think D. H. Lawrence's dislike of "Jews of the wrong sort" is a remarkable parallel with the subsequent Father Coughlin. The fact that Lawrence wrote a play for a Jewish actress is perhaps merely a matter of professional utility, just as he was willing to use a Jewish publisher (Thomas Seltzer), of whom he wrote: "He is a tiny Jew but trustworthy." And the fact that he drew a sympathetic Jew in *Kangaroo* does not disprove his anti-Semitism any more than that of Dickens is disproved because, after protests about Fagin, he created the character of Mr. Riah in *Our Mutual Friend*.

I don't quite see how Mr. Martin's quotation about symbolism refutes anything I said. Obviously all art is, in one sense, symbolic; but within the world of art there is a special style in which the artist draws the reader's attention to the symbols as such and deliberately uses this extra consciousness of the symbol for esthetic purposes. This, according to Mr. Martin's quotation, Lawrence did not do. Lawrence may have discovered a private "unconscious symbolism" in *Lady Chatterley* when he was finished, but in the sense in which most critics use the term, symbolism could no more be unconscious than could realism.

STANLEY KAUFFMANN
New York, N. Y.

► *The African Political Leaders*

SIRS:

I HAVE just seen your editorial comment (*NR*, May 25) on Tom Mboya. I think your appraisal of him is a very fair one. However, I would like to make this one comment on the difficulties which Tom Mboya faces in Kenya, along with other African political leaders. Essentially the problem is that the emergency regulations are still in existence. This makes it impossible for country-wide political organization to be carried on. You will note that his own political party is restricted entirely to Nairobi. There will be no objective way of assessing the mass following that any political leader has in Kenya until the emergency regulations are lifted and the various political leaders can organize throughout the country. When this day arrives, and one hopes that the government would permit it immediately, then it will be obvious which leadership the African people are ready to follow. I myself have no doubt of the fact that Mboya will be able to organize a very effective political movement.

One of the advantages from an African point of view in the lifting of the emergency regulations will be that competition among the African leaders will rise to a new and more satisfactory level. At the present time these leaders can not really take their differences, whatever they may be, to the people in any effective way.

GEORGE M. HOUSER
American Committee on Africa
New York, N. Y.

The State of the Unions

What Has the Labor Movement Become?

Where Is It Going?

A Series by Warner Bloomberg, Jr., Joel Seidman, Victor Hoffmann

Appearing Now in The New Republic

In preparation for a year, these articles are among the most thoughtful and timely we have ever published.

An opportunity to introduce the NR to others

GIFT ORDER COUPON

Send the next 25 issues of THE NEW REPUBLIC, also include the complete series on the American labor movement, to

NAME .....

ADDRESS .....

CITY ..... ZONE ..... STATE .....

Name of Donor .....

Please include my own subscription as checked below:

☐ New Subscription ☐ Renewal

I enclose $..... for ..... subscriptions

☐ Bill me later

25 issues

($6.25 single copy value)

$3

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED